United States District Court Southern District of Texas

## ENTERED

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

November 26, 2024 Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

HOLLOWAY LODGING	§	
(222 BENMAR), LLC, and	§	
HOLLOWAY LODGING	§	
(16666 NORTHCHASE), LLC,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
VS.	§	Civil Action No. 4:22-CV-01982
	§	
ACE AMERICAN	§	
INSURANCE COMPANY,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

## ORDER ACCEPTING CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Pending before the Court is the October 11, 2024, Memorandum and Recommendation ("M&R") prepared by Magistrate Judge Peter Bray. (Dkt. No. 37). Judge Bray made findings and conclusions and recommended denying Plaintiffs Holloway Lodging (222 Benmar) LLC and Holloway Lodging (16666 Northchase) LLC's ("Plaintiffs") Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, (Dkt. No. 34), as to Defendant ACE American Insurance Company ("ACE"), (see Dkt. No. 37).

The Parties were provided proper notice and the opportunity to object to the M&R. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). On October 25, 2024, Plaintiffs objected to the M&R, (Dkt. No. 38), incorporating by reference the objections to the M&R filed in a related case, (*see* 4:22-CV-01745, Dkt. No. 57). On November 8, 2024, ACE responded to Plaintiffs' objections, (Dkt. No. 39), also incorporating by reference the responses filed in the related case, (4:22-CV-01745, Dkt. No. 58).

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court must "make a de novo determination of those portions of the [magistrate judge's] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection [has been] made." After conducting this de novo review, the Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." *Id.; see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

The Court has carefully considered de novo those portions of the M&R to which objections have been made and reviewed the remaining proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendations for plain error. While the Court does not adopt the reasoning by Judge Bray, the Court agrees with the conclusion—that is, Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, (Dkt. No. 34), should be **DENIED**.

The Parties shall submit a Proposed Scheduling Order for all remaining unexpired dates no later than December 10, 2024.

It is SO ORDERED.

Signed on November 26, 2024.

Drew B. Tipton

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE